

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

Addendum # 2



Department Of Executive Services
Finance and Business Operations Division
**Procurement and Contract Services
Section**
206-684-1681 TTY RELAY: 711

DATE ISSUED: December 7, 2004

RFP Title:	IT Consulting Services Roster
Requesting Dept./ Div.:	King County Office of Information Resource Management
RFP Number:	169-04RLD
Due Date:	December 9, 2004 - 2:00 P.M.
Buyer:	Roy L. Dodman, roy.dodman@metrokc.gov (206) 263-4266

This addendum is issued to revised the original Request for Proposal, dated October 21, 2004 as follows:

1. The proposal opening date remains the same: Thursday, December 9, 2004 no later than 2:00 p.m. exactly.

The following information is provided in response to questions received:

Q1: On Page 31 of the RFQ you ask for methodologies. We would like to know what kind of information does the County require? For example, are you asking for instruction methodology such as instructor-led, e-learning, Computer-Based-Training? Or, is it asking about the methodology in determining classes for students such as subjective skills analysis, objective skills analysis? Finally, are you asking for methodologies we use in keeping our instructors skills up to speed?

A1: If you are proposing to provide training – the County needs to know what methodologies you use. If you propose to develop custom training programs, what is your methodology for interviewing us or analyzing our needs and then developing the training program, etc.

Q2: Regarding a request for financial information, how many years of history does the County want?

A2: It is up to the individual submitter to determine what information they believe is sufficient to prove to the County that they are financially sound.

Q3: Can you provide information on which PeopleSoft version and modules King County has? We know you have Human Resources (HR); what modules within HR? Do you also employ (own) PeopleSoft Financials? If so, which modules?

A3: The County has PeopleSoft HRMS 8 SP1 residing in an Oracle database. We use the HR, Payroll, Ben Admin and Time and Labor modules. We also have implemented ePay from the eApps modules, Training Administration and Labor Relations. We do not have PeopleSoft Financials.

Q4: As per the RFQ our company needs to provide project profiles for each of the category. For sections such as "Technical Writing & Documentation & Security" our respective group shares the case studies based on client request as most of them are confidential work done with other clients.

We are capable of delivering of what is expected in the RFQ. It is just a concern that some of the information is confidential, and cannot be provided directly in the response. As such, we are concerned that we might be eliminated from consideration in those categories. Does the County have an opinion and/or solution to this problem, such as this information being provided on request?

A4: Proposers need to provide the County with the best information possible so that their qualifications and work history can be documented. Responses will be relative to other submitters; if some submitters

refrain from making information available due to confidentiality while others do not, then the scoring for those submitters offering thorough information will be reflected in the County's evaluation.

Q5: Methodologies – Are you using custom courses as your example? Or, are you saying that the RFP implies an answer around custom courses only? I just want to make sure that I reply responsively to the RFP.

A5: *The County used custom courses as an example of something submitters might provide to us.*

Q6: Would a Dunn & Bradstreet rating be sufficient to answer about our financial stability?

A6: *The County has been receiving many versions of the "Financial" question. Some proposers are able to provide a Dunn & Bradstreet report, and others not. Other submitters appear to only be willing to provide a balance sheet. The best answer the County can offer is that we will review each response to the financial question, and make a determination based on the submitted information. The County may also elect to request additional information from individual proposers as necessary.*

AS THIS ADDENDUM HAS BEEN ISSUED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY, IT DOES NOT NEED TO BE RETURNED TO KING COUNTY IN ORDER TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR CONTRACT AWARD.